

Message

---

**From:** Liljegren, Jennifer [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C7098A838CD34F75B8878571FE95D939-JLILJEGR]  
**Sent:** 4/6/2018 7:44:37 PM  
**To:** Svingen, Eric [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=6cc799e3a0e04ea6b190f99e036b7ce7-ESvingen]  
**Subject:** RE: Is there a technical basis to Wisconsin's recommendation?  
**Attachments:** RTC draft\_4.2.18.docx

Eric,

I have reviewed the material from Wisconsin

**Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

# Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

# Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

I hope this helps. Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Jenny

Jenny Liljegren, PhD  
Physical Scientist  
Attainment Planning and Maintenance Section  
U.S. EPA Air and Radiation Division - Region 5

---

**From:** Svingen, Eric  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 4:45 PM  
**To:** Liljegren, Jennifer  
**Subject:** Is there a technical basis to Wisconsin's recommendation?

Hi Jenny -

I'm trying to better understand the technical basis of Wisconsin's 20 April 2017 letter, which proposes a nonattainment "contour" in Kenosha County extending 4.2 miles from the Lake Michigan shoreline. I know you have spent a huge amount of time considering Wisconsin's similar recommendations for counties further north, so I wonder if you can answer a few questions and clarify my thoughts regarding Kenosha.

Wisconsin's recommendation (to be precise, this is a fallback recommendation, should EPA not designate the entire state attainment) rests on calculations explained on pages 44 through 50 of its letter.

**Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

# Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

# **Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Eric